DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 179 998 CS 205 359

AUTHOR Penelope, Julia
TITLE The Articulation of Bias: Hoof in Mouth Disease.
PUB DATE Nov 79
NOTE 33p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English (69th, San Francisco, CA, November 22-24, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bias: *Discriminatory Attitudes (Social): *Homosexuality: *Language Usage: Literary Analysis: Literature: Negative Attitudes: Sex Discrimination: *Sex Stereotypes: *Sexuality: Social Influences: Socialization
IDENTIFIERS Doublespeak

ABSTRACT

Heterosexism, as defined in this paper, designates those central social structures that advocate heterosexuality as the only natural sexual interest. The cluster of social mores that constitute heterosexist attitudes is defined and described, with illustrations from various contexts showing both the subtle and the overt ways in which these attitudes are conveyed. The selections are intended to show what the doublespeak of heterosexism sounds like in a varied assortment of contexts. These illustrations indicate the scope of the problem and the ways in which it appears in the kinds of literature that most people read. A list of sample quotations from six books is attached. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED179998

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Articulation of Bias: Hoof in Mouth Disease*

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Julia Penelope

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Julia Penelope
Department of English
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588

*The paper will be delivered at the annual convention of the National Council of Teachers of English, San Francisco, November 22-24, 1979.

CS205359

Heterosexist language, like so many of the social diseases that require radical treatment, must be understood to be, in and of itself, one of the few manifest symptoms of a thorough-going systemic corruption of human intelligence. Like poison, once ingested by the unsuspecting, it spreads through every tissue of our thought, permeating our concepts of ourselves and others. Like cancer, allowed to compound itself without hindrance, it sets a system at internal war with itself, a conflict so ravaging that it is fatal to constructive as well as destructive elements of the system. Unlike either of these pathological conditions, however, neutralization of its effects aan be gradually accomplished by the strong-willed action of a mind determined to heal itself. In an effort to educate my well-intentioned colleagues about the pernicious effects of heterosexist language, I will define and describe that cluster of social mores that constitute HETERO-SEXIST ATTITUDES, illustrate the subtle and not-so-subtle ways in which these attitudes are conveyed in various verbal contexts, and discuss the implications of this research for classroom teachers and their students. In so little time, I will only be able to offer a few examples of heterosexism, but I trust they will be enough to demonstrate the prevalence of heterosexism and some of the ways in which it is expressed.

The term HETEROSEXISM, as its compounding suggests, is directly related to the term SEXISM, and to that particular constellation of patriarchal values which defines wimmin as sexually, intellectually, and emotionally inferior to males, prescribes that the proper conduct for wimmin is passivity, servility, domesticity, and maintains social institutions which insure the economic dependence of wimmin on males, either through husbands or fathers. HETERO-

SEXISM designates, in particular, those central social structures which proscribe heterosexuality as the only "natural" sexual interest, marriage as the only "appropriate" condition for heterosexual liaisons (endorsed by both the church and state), and child-bearing as the only "natural" and legitimate role for wimmin. One of the biographies I'll discuss illustrates the relatedness of sexism and heterosexism, and how a failure to acknowledge those assumptions affects the biographer's interpretation. Various of the sciences, such as biology and psychology, have contributed their own perspectives to these dogma; sociobiology is merely the latest to take up the banner in the service of patriarchy.

To give you some idea of the ways in which heterosexism manifests itself in the sciences, perhaps an example from E. O. Wilson's Sociobiology will illustrate the effects of heterosexism in a text that is purportedly scientific, hence "objective." In Sociobiology, Wilson constructs what he calls the "spinster hypothesis" to characterize those situations in which "an animal that has little chance of succeeding on its own chooses instead to serve a close relative" (p. 290). The "spinster hypothesis" is a thinly-veiled assertion that a womon who chooses to live with a relative "couldn't 'catch' a man," the corollary being that she is somehow "unwomanly," "unfit," and "inferior" to other wimmin. Wilson later characterizes females who bond with other females (who have offspring) as "maiden aunts" (pp. 311, 343). In this context, the phrase "maiden aunts" is clearly merely a way of avoiding the fact that there are Lesbians in other species as well as our own. (I am indebted to Sarah Lucia Hoagland's paper, "Androcentric Rhetoric in Sociobiology," for these examples.) The point, put succinctly, is this: Once one assumes that heterosexuality is the only possible, "natural,"

"satisfying," or "desirable" type of intra-species relationship, one's perceptions suffer in three distinct ways. First, one's perceptual categories are narrowed to include just those events, persons, and relationships that fit (or appear to fit) those categorical givens; second, when an individual encounters someone or something that does not fit those givens, there may be an attempt to force them into one's preconceptions in order to maintain the integrity and security of the pre-established conceptual system; third, one may choose to ignore, discount, or trivialize those events or persons that refuse to conform to the pre-existing structures and definitions. In the latter two instances, such coercive conceptualization enables the individual to maintain a falsified description of the world at the expense of other people's lives and feelings while the first way of handling anomalous persons and events forces them to try and pretend that they can identify with the narrowed perceptions. In any case, such methods are dishonest and destructive, and I would hope that no one in this audience would knowingly contribute to the perpetuation of false descriptions.

In fact, an objective analysis of our society reveals that there is hardly a facet of our daily experience that is not affected, if not overtly structured, by heterosexist assumptions and the cultural institutions that teach and spread them: the various post-matriarchal religions of the father and their rituals; the texts, lessons, and examples used in our schools at every level; those artifacts labeled as "art" by the arbitrators of taste; all of the news and entertainment media, and the advertising upon which they depend for their survival. It is, in fact, important, if not immediately clear to everyone, that heterosexuality is the direct beneficiary of one of the most sustained, vigorous, and omnipresent media hypes in all of recorded

history, and, the media barrage has been so successful that a mere handful of individuals has thought it worth comment, no matter how miserable and uncomfortable their own lives were (or are) because they believed what they were told as children. For this reason, it should be pointed out, in the "Year of the Child," that children are the primary targets of this brain-washing, for they are obviously the ones who are being groomed to take their places as the next generation of "heterosexuals," and it is equally important to note that the schools, which have responsibility for these children for a minimum of 12 years, are one, if not THE, primary institutions in which these children are indoctrinated, at ages when they have little consciousness of the choices they will make later in their lives if they're lucky enough to know they have choices!

It is, perhaps, one of the characteristics of the human condition that we are frequently unaware and insensitive to the way our uses of language sound in the unprotected ears of others. Apparently, we rarely stop to consider the fact that language <u>is</u> action in the sense that words, like other human artifacts, have effects on the lives of others, and these effects can be destructive as well as constructive, oppressive as well as supportive. It is worth stating here that HETEROSEXISM is <u>not</u> just "a prejudice," which would imply that it is an irrational or idiosyncratic view held by a few "bigots" or "crazies," nor is it "merely" some mysterious, nonrational, "unconscious" kind of attitude that "slips out" when the speaker's guard is down. HETEROSEXISM is the dominant perspective of patriarchal culture. It is the filter through which each one of us describes events to ourselves and others; it is the basis of metaphors that define human behavior (and that of animals as well); it is the central assumption upon which all other cultural

assumptions are based. The fact that HETEROSEXISM is the perceptual screen provided by our cultural conditioning, and not "just" a conceptual aberration of the "unenlightened," will be demonstrated by the texts I have chosen to discuss, which not only acknowledge lesbianism (or homosexuality) as a lifestyle, (which is often applauded by the grateful among us), but also purport, in some way, to be "tolerant" and "open-minded." It is this veneer of tolerance that can be as destructive as silence or explicit denial because of its subtlety.

My examples are drawn from three biographies, one novel, non-fiction and Heresies, a feminist journal, all of them published in the 1970's and therefore immune to the caveat that the writer couldn't "have know any better." HETEROSEXISM, as I've said, is found everywhere. It is our cultural milieu, for all but a few of us who have begun to construct our own cultures in which we find some escape from its omnipresence. I don't intend to spend a lot of time pointing to obvious examples, such as the use of faggot or "swish" jokes to get a laugh from a bored class, the large number of pejorative terms, e. g., *nelly, queer, cuntlapper, cock-sucker etc.*, used to intimidate the unsure or demean the proud, nor will I examine the uses of terms such as natural/unnatural, rational/irrational, logical/illogical, healthy/sick, legitimate/illegitimate, appropriate/inappropriate, to name but a few, which occur frequently in overtly pro-heterosexuality propaganda published by the legal and psychiatric professions, various church and lay organizations like Anita Bryant's. The varieties of doublespeak that betrays the doublethink of such writing is too obvious to merit serious attention, and since the language of such advocates is so contradictory, it often has the opposite effect from that intended by its writers: It

exposes the ugliness of fear and repulsion and wins people to our struggle to be heard. It is also unfortunate that I cannot dwell on the use of silence as a means of denying the existence of approximately 20% of U. S. citizens, most of us taxpayers, and some of us members of that meddling group, the P.T.A., although it is undoubtedly silence that has been the most successful and potent weapon used in the crippling of young minds. The effects of centuries of silence on the lives of Lesbians and Gay men are now being fully documented by others more able than I to do so, and, when their documentation becomes available, it will be a matter of great shame for our entire profession as well as others, should any be sensitive enough to consider the pain for which they are responsible.

I do not need to tell this audience that much of the work in the field of literary studies abounds with examples of heterosexist language, and I haven't the time to go through each sentence to show how specific words betray heterosexism, so I will only point out specific passages in a few texts to illustrate the guises in which heterosexism appears. My first series of examples are taken from the "official" biography of Radclyffe Hall, Radclyffe Hall at the Well of Loneliness: A Sapphic Chronicle (1975) by Lovat Dickson, the man who was personally entrusted by Una Troubridge with Hall's personal papers. In his introductory chapter to the biography, Dickson quite honestly admits that, at 45, his "mind still harbored those early inhibitions" about the subject of homosexuality, but goes on to say that "Una was able to help me shake free of them before there was a general discarding of them everywhere" (p. 18). We are to understand from this assertion that he is unbiased. But he says that, in spite of his new-found liberality, he was still "not yet ready to write the biography, which would demand

complete sympathy, even partisanship" (p. 19). Yet, at the end of this chapter, when we have been given to understand that he is now ready to undertake a biography that will be free of his earlier preconceptions, we find a paragraph that perfectly represents the way in which heterosexism surfaces in an account we must assume to be well-intentioned.

> What prodigious love it must have taken to keep these two together through thick and thin. The diary shows the frequent and passionate domestic rows. *It may have been an unholy love,* but it had some element which survived the white heat of passion and the cold deadness, *the non-feeling which is so often the consequence of unnatural union.*
> [My italics]
>
> (pp. 22-3)

In Chapter Two, Dickson begins his biography by asking the question, "Why?" He says: "And what drove them to the course they followed?" He decides first that, while Radclyffe Hall was, by her own definition, a "congenital invert," Una Troubridge was a bisexual, "for she was already married and the mother of a child when she fell in love with Radclyffe Hall" (p. 24). (Why marriage and having children are still seen as purely "heterosexual" remains beyond me.) Then, astoundingly, he characterizes Troubridge as a "neurasthenic wreck," and "while her husband adored her and she thought that she loved him, she used every excuse to get away from him, or to postpone joining him whereever he was stationed" (p. 24). He decides that, "One might have explained this merely as frigidity, except that she was a very passionate lover when she fell in love with a woman. Bisexuality seems hardly the term to describe a volte-face of this kind" (pp. 24-5). What is strange here, aside from his own contradictory ramblings, is Dickson's use of the phrase volte-face to

describe what was clearly not an "about face" on the part of Una Troubridge. What becomes clear, as one reads around the language of Dickson, is the fact that Troubridge was as much a Lesbian in any sense as Hall, and her marriage and having children in no way obviate the application of the term Lesbian to her. Once she had fallen in love with Radclyffe Hall, and discovered her own Lesbianism, there appears to have been no question on her part. (Other choice selections appear on the handout, some of which reveal how Dickson thought about Una Troubridge during their initial meetings.)

Lest anyone suspect that only men are guilty of heterosexism in their biographies of Lesbian wimmin, consider the following excerpt from Millay in Greenwich Village, written by Anne Cheney and published in 1975:

> Even more dramatic than her change in religious attitudes was Millay's sexual metamorphosis. While at Vassar, *she found more meaning in friendships with women than with men,* and her play The Lamp and the Bell and her poem 'Memorial to D. C.' celebrate the power of lesbian love. Again, *she needed her 'teachers,'* Floyd Dell and other lovers, *to initiate her into heterosexual love,* which she so deftly expressed in sonnets such as 'What lips my lips have kissed,' 'Into the golden vessel of great song,' and 'Love is not all.'
>
> . . .Here [in Greenwich Village] Millay was exposed to the most *avant-garde ideas* of the day, developed a broader concept of religion, and *shifted from lesbian to heterosexual love. . . --they were free of the repressions and limitations of the Silent Majority.* [My italics]
>
> (p. 4)

One doesn't have to read far into Cheney's biography to discover that the major thesis of her book is that Millay's great "transformation" was from lesbian to heterosexual, and that this "metamorphosis" is the source of her "great art." Word choices that are fairly obvious, such as speaking of her love affairs with other wimmin as "friendships," whereas her male attachments

are "lovers," or Cheney's statement that Millay "needed" to be "initiated" into heterosexuality seems mundane when compared to the perverse point of view that can characterize heterosexuality as among "the most avant-garde ideas of the day," when it is the reverse stereotype that is usually called upon (that the "perverts" and "freaks" are the avant-garde), and the kind of mind so rabidly heterosexist that it manages to say that the expression of heterosexuality could "flower" in the freedom of Greenwich Village because it is heterosexuality that is "repressed" and "limited" by the "Silent Majority"! Here we have some sort of inverted radical rhetoric turned to the uses of the oppressors. As the additonal excerpts from Cheney's book illustrate, it was Millay's "growth" into heterosexuality that produced the "power" of her love poems, and other excerpts show a similarly shallow conception of events and issues, such as the first wave of feminism, which was just ending when Millay was writing.

Yet another biography of the 1970's, Virginia Spencer Carr's *The Lonely Hunter: A Biography of Carson McCullers* (1976), manages to misportray and grossly misinterpret the agonies of a Lesbian and a gay man, Carson McCullers and her husband, Reeves. For example, at one point, Carr goes so far as to describe Reeves as "Not strongly identified in his own sexuality" (p. 295), because he fell deeply, and mutually in love with David Diamond, the composer, and we are told that Carson McCullers "realized also, however, that her ambivalent nature demanded, craved, a reciprocal love relationship with a woman" (p. 167). Carr presents us with a portrait of two weak, childish individuals who "fail" at heterosexuality because they aren't "strongly identified" in their sexuality, or "ambivalent." What on earth can such terms mean in a book that carefully, almost meticulously, details what is really the internal

destruction of two human beings who were, respectively, a Lesbian and a gay man, and whose greatest "failure" was their attempt to pretend to be something they clearly were not, heterosexuals! One lengthy quotation from Carr's book will demonstrate how her heterosexual perceptions distort the descriptions she provides, and the intimate connection between sexism and heterosexism.

> In spite of Reeves's pride over his wife's accomplishments, it was recognition such as this that contributed to their tenuous marital relationship. To be the husband of Carson McCullers was sometimes devastating to his sense of manhood, . . .Reeves, the writer, was dead--and had been--once he consented to move into the shadow of his wife's genius. . . *The tragedy of Reeves's life,* and the pity of it, was what he had feared in the spring of 1945 upon his emarriage to Carson, in a sense, his capitulation, and then his compulsory disability discharge from the United States Army--*that he could not always be a leader of men, a professional soldier, the head of a household, a man's man.*
>
> Therein lay *another problem,* too. *Not strongly identified in his own sexuality--. . .having sexual problems himself* which he could not resolve, Reeves was incapable of coping with his wife's sexual inclinations *or of helping her to become more heterosexually oriented. Carson was completely open to her friends about her tremendous enjoyment in being physically close to attractive women. She was as frank and as open about this aspect of her nature as a child would be in choosing which toy he* [sic!] *most wanted to play with. She was always more physically attracted to women than to men.* [My italics]
>
> (p. 295)

As this passage makes clear sexuality is heterosexuality and nothing else qualifies; homosexuality is "a problem," something to be overcome; and in, spite of her own description of Carson's openness about her Lesbianism, Carr presumes that it was somehow Reeves's responsibility to "orient" her toward heterosexuality, that being, by author's fiat, the most desirable state.

for any human being. If Reeves had just been "more of a man," we are given to understand, then Carson wouldn't have been so attracted to women. If Carson hadn't been successful, Reeves would have been a "man's man," and could have made her into a heterosexual. Thus, Carr asserts her contention that if both individuals had conformed to the sexual/social roles decreed for them, with Carson the passive subordinate and Reeves the masterful superior, all would have been right with their lives. In its own, misconceived, misrepresented fashion, such a biography is more destructive than some of those that opt for obliqueness or obscurity; Carr's perceptions of and interpretations of the lives of both Carson and Reeves is so skewed by her heterosexism that she fails to see what is before her in all of her material: her biography is actually not a "biography" of Carson McCullers; it is a detailed documentation of the ruin of two human beings who, because of their sexuality, were the victims of patriarchal social and moral institutions. What Carr demonstrates, even against her will, are the tragic results of an attempt by two people to be what they had been told they had to be.

My last three examples come, not from biographies, but from a novel, a "non-fiction" book, and a feminist journal. The novel, The Memoirs of a Survivor by Doris Lessing (1975), is a surrealistic venture into the future, into a world in which all the customs and mores we take for granted have crumbled, everything, that is, except for the narrator's unfavorable portrayal of attraction and love between women. In the following excerpt, for example, the narrator finally assures herself that there is nothing sexual going on between Emily and June, two of the major characters in Lessing's vision of the future.

> I offered the big sofa in the living-room to June, but she preferred a mattress on Emily's floor, and *even*, I think, slept on it, *though of course I wondered.* Too often had I experienced a sharp shocked reaction to questions asked innocently. I really did not know if Emily and June would consider lesbianism as the most normal thing in the world, or as improper. Styles and morals had changed so sharply and so often in my lifetime, . . ., that I had learned long ago to accept whatever was the norm for that particular time and place. *I rather believe that the two girls slept in each other's arms for comfort.* [My italics]
>
> (p. 154)

A generous narrator, indeed! Later, however, we learn that

> There was also a woman, who led a small band of girls. They were self-consciously and loudly critical of male authority, male organisation, as if they had set themselves a duty always to be there commenting on everything the men did. They were a chorus of condemnation. *Yet the leader seemed to find it necessary to spend a great deal of energy preventing individuals of her flock from straying off and attaching themselves to the men.* [My italics]
>
> (p. 160)

We are then told that she and Emily "lose" June to the women's group, and the narrator's explanation for this event and her description of June's emotional capacities deserve attention.

> Love, devotion, effort could only pour into her, a jug without a bottom, and then pour out, leaving no trace. *She deserved nothing, was owed nothing,* could not really be loved, and therefore could not be missed. So she had gone. Probably one of the women had been kind to her, *and to this little glow of affection June had responded, as she had to Emily's. . . At last we agreed that the energetic and virile woman who led that band had captured the listless June with her energy,* at a time when Emily did not have enough to go around. [My italics]
>
> (p. 167)

Emily, of course, is healthily obsessed with a young hoodlum, Gerald, whose virtues remain as obscure to the reader as June's preference for attaching herself to strong women. Thus, as Lessing's narrator would have it, we have a rather pitiful, unloving, empty vessel who, utterly passive, is "captured" by the leader of a women's gang. Somehow, that Lessing would use the word virile is inevitable. There are other novels in which one finds skewed descriptions of lesbianism and homosexuality such as Ursula Le Guin's The Dispossessed and Patricia Nell Warren's The Frontrunner. Although I haven't the time here to actually quote from either, it is worth noting in passing that on LeGuin's planet of equality and freedom and reason, the narrator informs us that homosexuality is tolerated, even condoned, but we are told only of one same-sex pairing, and that is male, while in The Frontrunner, a great favorite among gay men, the one major lesbian character winds up agreeing to have the child of the dead runner (by artificial insemination--they had saved some of his semen!) and ends up keeping house for the bereaved lover of the dead man, serving coffee and cocktails to his guests like any good housewife!

The Coming Age of Woman Power, by Konrad Kellen (1972), proclaimed as "a political scientist's sweeping, original preview" of the results of the second wave of feminism, contained the following prediction in 1972:

> If lesbians are proud of their habit, it connotes to them the ultimate independence from that dreadful creature, man, *whom they dislike intensely* (and, in our day, often for good reason) But some of the lesbians interviewed *are not totally convincing,* because their lesbianism seems partly ideological rather than 'straight' and *therefore presumably is less durable.* If in the coming decade society becomes more feminized, more sensitive, more gentle in the way that seems possible: if it becomes thereby more truly civilized, more responsive to people's true condition and needs, homosexuality is

> likely to decline drastically. In one way that would be ironic: the gays of both sexes, having finally attained a *liberation and social recognition of sorts* after centuries of oppression and persecution and contempt, would then *more or less* vanish from the scene just when they have managed to make that scene. Yet everything suggests that homosexuality is likely to be less widespread in the 1980s, among men and women, than it ever has been, *mainly because the liberated female will be a better mother to her growing children*, but also for social reasons. [My italics]
>
> (pp. 128-9)

A glance at our calendars might be enough to convince even the most generous among us of the stupidity of this social scientist's predictions, but I'd like to explore further some of the assumptions that covertly make his suggestions plausible, even in 1979. First, he asserts that Lesbianism is a "habit" (isn't heterosexuality also a "habit," then?), that pride in one's Lesbianism necessarily derives from independence from men (which then intrudes males once more into definitions of female sexuality), rather than love of other wimmin, and hatred of men, which again asserts that Lesbianism is a reaction against males rather than an attraction to other wimmin. Then he neatly makes a subtle distinction between "straight" Lesbianism (a concept which eludes me) and "ideological" Lesbianism, which is "less convincing" and therefore (????) "less durable"!! (And, we are justified in asking "to whom" all this cause-effect reasoning seems plausible!) The remainder of his arguments follow from his assumptions that: Heterosexuality is sexuality (much in the same fashion David Reubens was able to blithely assert that "lesbianism doesn't exist" because "one vagina plus one vagina equals zero"): since Lesbianism is defined as a rejection of the male sex, wimmin who merely "imagine" they're Lesbians will do one of those "about faces" and "return"

to their "real" partners, men (the male sex still being the axis of the "real world") after men stop acting like bullies, dolts, and fools. And--we're supposed to "vanish" after we've achieved "a liberation and social recognition of sorts," but, notice, NOT, and NEVER, the "real thing." Kellen's last sentence exemplifies again the intimate connection between sexist and heterosexist doublethink: Lesbians and Gay men will disappear because wimmin will be "better mothers" (in this revolutionized "new world"), because it's always been "mother's fault" that everything has gone wrong in the world.

At the risk of boring you with yet one more example, I will do so because it comes from the first issue of Heresies, "A Feminist publication on Art and Politics," which began publishing in January, 1977. In the lead article of that issue, which served to introduce the magazine and its "revolutionary' socialist feminism, "Toward Socialist Feminism" by Barbara Ehrenreich, she reveals that her vision of the future, after capitalism and imperialism are destroyed, is to be as heterosexist as the system in which we live. For me, and for many other Lesbians and Gay men, socialism has been, and is, a "people's" revolution that not only excludes us as "people," but defines our lifestyle as "counter-revolutionary" and "a product of bourgeois decadence," thereby justifying the wholesale slaughter of Lesbians and Gays in socialist territories. That Ehrenreich thinks of socialism only as a politics for heterosexuals surfaces in her first paragraph:

> At some level, perhaps not too well articulated, socialist feminism has been around for a long time. You are a woman in a capitalist society. You get pissed off: about the job, about the bills, *about your husband (or ex), about the kids' school, the housework*, being pretty, not being pretty, being looked at, not being looked at . . ., etc. If you think about all these things and how they fit

> together and what has to be changed, and then you look around for some words to hold all these thoughts together in abbreviated form, you'd almost have to come up with something like 'socialist feminism.'
> [My italics]
>
> (p. 4)

Well, so much for those handy labels that will inevitably add up to "something like 'socialist feminism.'" Even if I grant that there are some Lesbians who still worryy about whether or not they're "pretty," they certainly aren't worrying about it with males in mind, and Ehrenreich makes it clear that she is thinking only of the situation of heterosexual wimmin by the prominence she gives to the phrase "your husband" and all that follows it in her list. As a reader of her paragraph, I have already disappeared, because I cannot read myself into that <u>your</u> that precedes <u>husband.</u> There is no "you, dear reader" in that paragraph that includes Lesbians. Later in her article, on p. 5, she castigates those "radical feminists" who call China a "patriarchy" because, she says, it ignores "the real struggles and achievements of millions of women." Perhaps so, but her analysis ignores the real murders of Lesbians and Gay men in Russia, Cuba, <u>and</u> China, and her silence on the subject of those slaughters is heterosexism; her silence denies the struggles of people who have been at the mercy of hostile rhetoric for too long. For such statements to appear in a journal that calls itself "feminist" is perhaps some measure of the tremendous power that such rhetoric holds over the ways in which we think.

As I have stressed throughout this presentation, my selections are intended to show what the doublespeak of heterosexism sounds like in a varied assortment of contexts. My analysis of these texts is not exhaustive and the range of my examples is not great. In spite of the limitations imposed

by the space and time allotted for this paper, I have, nevertheless, tried to provide some idea of the scope of the problem and the ways in which it appears in the kinds of literature many of us read. It is far too easy to attempt to enjoin Lesbians and Gays to renewed silence by claiming that "all that sort of thing (meaning bigotry) is behind us now." Such statements only reveal that the speaker feels threatened and doesn't want to hear about Lesbians and Gays anymore. I would remind such people that it is still possible in some cities to dial the KKK phone number and to be told to "kill queers." I would remind such people that the recent revelations concerning the possible love relationship between Eleanor Roosevelt and Lorena Hickok have been dismissed with hostility, derision, disbelief, and defamation in every newspaper I've seen, including the New York Times (10/21/79) and the New York Post (10/24/79), and in Time magazine.

Those of our colleagues who are honest about their fears are quite right when they say that Pro-Lesbian/Gay resolutions in our professional organizations will affect what is said in the classroom and what is taught. Those resolutions mean that we no longer will sit quietly and be the butt of cheap jokes at our expense, and we will no longer tolerate the teaching of lies about us to new generations of school children. In the future, perhaps, it won't be enough to get off a "queer" joke to wake up the dullards in the back of the room. Perhaps, finally, the contributions of Lesbians and Gays will be openly acknowledged in the classrooms of this country.

References

Carr, Virginia Spencer. 1976. The Lonely Hunter: A Biography of Carson McCullers. New York: Doubleday.

Cheney, Anne. 1975. Millay in Greenwich Village. Birmingham: University of Alabama Press.

Dickson, Lovat. 1975. Radclyffe Hall at the Well of Loneliness. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Ehrenreich, Barbara. 1977. "Toward Socialist Feminism," Heresies 1 (January), 4-7.

Hoagland, Sarah Lucia. 1978. "Androcentric Rhetoric in Sociobiology," paper delivered at the Modern Language Association, New York City, December 27-30.

Kellen, Konrad. 1972. The Coming Age of Woman Power. New York: Peter H. Wyden, Inc.

Lessing, Doris. 1975. The Memoirs of a Survivor. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Handout
Julia Penelope
NCTE 1979

"The Articulation of Bias: Hoof in Mouth Disease"

I. Sample quotations from Lovat Dickson's Radclyffe Hall at the Well of Loneliness:

1. "Good" hands:

The books were very good, had been much praised by the critics. The verse was highly thought of, and a lot of it had been set to music. The royalties that came in were really quite substantial, and the copyrights would be left to me on Una's death. She did not expect my firm to reprint the books; she wanted only advice, and the satisfaction of knowing that they would be in good hands after her death.

(p.15)

2. Dickson and Troubridge:

I had been curious as to what kind of confidences would be given and even wondered whether these would be embarrassing. I need not have worried. I was talking as to a widow, one who thought she was separated only by an impalpable veil from reunion with her adored one. I was emboldened to ask her about the social embarrassments and difficulties that went along with their condition. Did female homosexuals keep company only with other inverts? Una's Admiral-husband had been said to have been the handsomest officer in the Royal Navy. What did it feel like if you had been the much-admired and envied wife of such a man to be swept off your feet by love for another woman

'The best friend a woman ever had,' she said, as though Marguerite were of the opposite sex. Yes, Una had loved men, but had never felt any inclination towards them after she had fallen in love with Marguerite. She had discovered then for the first time what sexual rapture felt like. The primness was only in her appearance. Talking quietly and closely, our heads together, in order not to be overheard, I could see that she had been very beautiful. It was not difficult to imagine her suffused with that hot content that burns away the flesh; and to imagine this flame lit by someone other than a man. She seemed to have absolutely no sense of embarrassment in talking about it all to me. . .

I found her company more engaging all the time, and she melted with me and I could see that she must have been flirtatious when she was young, when the Admiral, so to speak, was in ownership. She was very good with men, pandered to their appetites, vanities and emotions, and once I had shown that I did not like the mood lugubrious about her departed lover, she kept off that tack, and we had many laughs together. . .

It sells today steadily in paperback editions in many languages, and what I rather squirmed about accepting as a responsibility has turned out, since I inherited it, to be a valuable literary property.

(pp. 16-17)

. . .I could remember Una Troubridge and Radclyffe Hall quite clearly. When I first came to London in 1929, they were well-known public figures, frequently to be seen lunching and dining at fashionable restaurants in London, or at the opening of a new play, when they customarily had seats in the front row. In the foyer between the acts they seemed to flaunt their unnatural connection, but this may have been my youthful imagination at work. Certainly they were very unusual-looking, Una with her monocle, and both of them smoking little green cigars. I wasn't the only one impressed. . .

Una Troubridge was fair and extremely pretty. She too looked masculine, but like an effeminate young man. Staring at them both with the eyes of youth, they seemed alluring and attractive figures, and I wondered to myself, as young men do, what the heat of their strange passion did to those mask-like beautiful faces, those slender limbs, dressed now so oddly. (p.14)

Her eyes were a washed-out blue, but they came to life as she talked of the past and of John, which was the name she called Radclyffe Hall. Her voice surprised me. It was so much at odds with her pale, unanimated expression. There was a tonal variety, a warmth and a depth to it which I have observed usually goes with strongly-sexed women.

(p. 16)

3. Homosexual "Flamboyancy":

Una once showed me a picture of them both, taken at a dog show. They wore men's Fedora hats, bought at Lock's in St. James's Street, and knickerbockers and golf stockings, suitable apparel for a dog show, and each is holding round her midriff a dog, their entries for that particular show. Who could mistake them for anything but 'queers'?

From such flamboyancy I shrank, until Una patiently explained that it is inseparable from homosexual love. The lovers know that their thoughts are pure, but they are aware that others regard inversion as impure. They do not want to be accepted as abnormal heterosexuals, but as normal homosexuals. There is a burning sincerity in establishing themselves as apart, but worthy. They send out in unusual clothes, mannerisms, gestures, signals of a difference they are aware may incite anger in the human pack, but which they are as incapable of hiding as an animal its scent.

Radclyffe Hall was a congenital invert. She had taught others to be brave about this. I was beginning to catch the glow of the embers that had stirred into flame between these two, but I was not yet ready to write the biography, which would demand complete sympathy, even partisanship.

In the end Una herself wrote the life in 1961.* She inscribed a copy to me, and I read it with a growing disappointment. It rang with reticence, which had been absent in her talks with me. She had been a successful translator, and had first introduced Colette to English readers, but she had no gift of characterization, and she had an unreserved admiration for her subject which puts off readers who prefer to make their own judgements.

(pp. 18-19)

4. Una's Prose:

Una was no natural diarist, but she was a young woman in love. I think for the first time in her life. Even her prose comes alight in the glow, and we can sense the furious consuming passion, knowing climaxes and joys, some psychologists say, often beyond the experience of heterosexual lovers. Yet with its bitter aftertaste of barrenness, always to mock the high moments. This is mentioned again and again. In heterosexual unions children come to bind the parents together when the first raptures are over. In homosexual unions there is nothing.

What prodigious love it must have taken to keep these two together through thick and thin. The diary shows the frequent and passionate domestic rows. It may have been an unholy love but it had some element which survived the white heat of passion and the cold deadness, the non-feeling which is so often the consequence of unnatural union.

(pp. 22-33)

5. Analysis of Radclyffe Hall:

One has to fall back on the old methods that writers use, intuitive rather than scientific. Look into the past, see what traits these characters inherited, examine their childhood for clues. . .

But when she returned from the hotel in Folkestone where her father had died, she was an independent young woman financially, and an extraordinarily difficult one, for which the Visettis were not altogether to blame. Although, if they had been sensible people and not so absorbed in their quarrels with each other, they might have given her a chance of a more normal life. Clifford Allen states unequivocally, 'I don't believe there is such a thing as inborn homosexuality, or if it does occur I have never been privileged to see such a case.'* To him it is the resistance power to the demand which determines the psychosexual inclination. There was nothing in Marguerite's upbringing to encourage or fortify resistance to the inclination, but everything to sharpen the temptation.

Now that she was financially independent she left the Visetti household, and took a house of her own in Church Street, Kensington, taking along her grandmother, old Mrs. Diehl, as chaperone. The old lady was merely a figurehead. Once installed in the house, Marguerite - or John as she now insisted on being called - had begun to dress like a man, to smoke and swagger, and keep strange company. . .

But at the same time these triumphs were at war with the struggle to become a poet, to be able to express all these passions and tempests that stormed through her mind, leaving her body intoxicated with joy, or sunk in lassitude and dejection. The fantasies of our childhood shape our personality. Hers were sending her in a direction from which there could be no withdrawing.

(pp. 30-31)

6. Analysis of Una Taylor Troubridge:

Sir Henry could only put a brave face on it. The girl had no fortune, and was not fitted to be a poor man's wife. But she was Irish, like his wife, and Irish girls can be happy without what money brings.

(p. 31)

But suddenly there was nothing more to laugh at. They were in debt, and alone in the world. Her father's death and the break-up of the home, made marriage essential, little taste though Una had for it. Her sister had spoiled the family hopes by marrying a journalist, Maurice Woods. In place of any of her young admirers, with several of whom she had sufficiently deep attachments, Una accepted, within a few months of her father's death, a captain in the Royal Navy, a widower twenty-five years older than herself with a grown-up family of his own. Captain Troubridge had everything to recommend him except that he had entered the Navy before Una had been born. He was in fact only ten years younger than her father, but he was a vital and vigorous man, extremely good-looking, and with a reputation for bravery which spread a sort of halo about him, and together with his handsomeness excited her enough to drive her in the direction which necessity was pushing her. Someone had to support her. Could she do better than this?

(pp. 34-5)

7. Mabel Batten and Radclyffe Hall:

Mabel Batten's interest at first was simply that of an older patron in a promising young writer. She saw that John had an ear for words, and a strong sense of rhythm, and she probably soon guessed that, while the turmoil of her emotions supplied the necessary source for the imaginative quality of 'Twixt Earth and Stars, the young poet had not come to terms with her condition, and was not yet fit to write poetry about love. . .

(p. 38)

Mabel Batten was a woman of great sophistication. What had been the shy awkward thrusts of a nature twisted by desire became under her gentle hands and whispered teaching smooth and accomplished love-making. John learnt not to make the wry self-deprecating jokes about her small compact breasts, her muscular shoulders, the narrow slender flanks of an athlete which seemed a parody of womanly form, but to see these things through the eyes of her adorer as beauty, and take pride in them. Love requires understanding if it is not to wither and die, most of all a love like this that must be secret. . .

It was this tragic sense of being shut out by her warped nature, not only from the pleasures life afforded normal people, but even from proper fulfilment of the anodyne she had made to replace it, her work, which Mabel Batten taught her not to weep about but to accept with pride, as a subtle distinction, not an ugly affliction. For the first time she could take delight in love. Never had she felt so deeply before.

(p. 39)

8. Hall's poetry:

The nispero tree, with its fruit gleaming gold from afar but bitter to the taste, is taken as a symbol of lesbian love. The wounded cries of the lovers at the barrenness which is the inevitable end of their passion is echoed again and again.

(p. 42)

Too soon, regret enters, and then comes the final sad realization of the barrenness of love to an invert.

(p. 48)

9. Una Troubridge and her husband:

There was something strongly sexual about her, and it was not just her looks or her cleverness, both of which she rather paraded, which attracted all sorts of men, but that subtle emanation of sexuality which I noticed in London when she was in her mid-sixties, when she was neglecting her appearance to the point of caricature.

With this quality, and with such a vigorous, handsome husband, why on earth was she unhappy? She was bored.

(p. 52)

His letters show Troubridge to have been the nicest possible kind of man, sympathetic, loving, anxious that his wife and the Cub should be happy. They also show that he was a simple-hearted, simple-minded person, doing his best to understand the quirks and vagaries of other people, while being wholly free of them himself. He did not want a seedy, tired wife, too listless to respond to him. He was all for her consulting this 'nerve chap'. But he little guessed the ultimate consequences. Crichton-Miller must have explained the facts of the situation, the nature of which one can only guess from the guarded terms used even in the diary to be connected with a sexual antipathy, which psychoanalysis might cure. But the Admiral was perhaps too embarrassed, or too excited by his new command, to take it in. Off he went to Malta alone on 18 January, and on the 23rd Una notes an 'epoch-making visit' to Crichton-Miller. This must have been the occasion when the doctor explained to her in full terms what inversion meant. She wrote to her husband all about it, and she notes on 3rd February: 'Two letters from Malta and made me so, so happy.'

Almost immediately she felt some benefit from the treatment. As the truth came pouring out of herself she discovered what it was that she had been repressing, which had resulted in these constant attacks of nausea, and had made her life a misery ever since her marriage.

(p. 54)

One cannot resist the conclusion that Troubridge's unhappy marriage had something to do with the failure of his career at this particular point. No one had ever doubted his courage or ability, especially his presence of mind in any situation requiring immediate decision. But he had had two unhappy years on the island since the days when he worked in the war-room with Winston Churchill, making strategic plans for instant action on the outbreak of hostilities, and they had made him a different man.

This simple, loyal, courageous officer was up against a force of nature with which he did not know how to deal. Of his love for his young wife, and his child, there cannot be the slightest doubt. But that he treated as tantrums, or the eccentricities of an artistic type of young woman, what were really symptoms of a disturbed psyche, not only did nothing to cure the differences; it aggravated them.

(pp. 61-2)

10. Una Troubridge and Radclyffe Hall meet:

Una was suddenly overcome on that August afternoon in Lady Clarendon's drawing-room by Radclyffe Hall's searching look. Her own neurotic condition made her ready to respond. She knew all about John, and was perfectly well aware of what was conveyed in the current that almost immediately began flowing between them. Her nervous troubles of the last few years had imposed a severe strain on her, and this had touched breaking-point in the court-martial and all the attendant publicity. She felt that Troubridge's failure had been at least partly her fault. She recognized that she owed him some loyalty, but like all neurotics she was an egomaniac. She longed now to be taken into somebody's arms and kissed and comforted, and she yearned to pour out to someone the great reservoir of passionate love stored up in her which her marriage had not succeeded in tapping. The right or wrong of homosexual love hardly occurred to her. She could feel the intensity of John's desire for her grow, and this aroused in her feelings that nothing except the solace of John's arms about her could assuage.

(pp. 63-4)

They had to be careful, and as the summer died, and Una allowed the unit to sail without her, it was the predator who hung back, and the victim who longed to be sacrificed.

(p. 67)

One cannot resist suspecting that the intensity of John's grief may in part have been a sexual ploy to entrap this young woman who had a solid husband and child with claims upon her. It was necessary to make her appear the pursuer.

(p. 71)

11. Hall and Troubridge's experiments with psychic phenomena:

How much of this was fraud, how much some genuine psychical phenomena into which these two neurasthenic women were plunged by the fierce intensity of concentration? Occasionally the responses to questions put by John are so banal it seems incredible that they can issue from the voice of one now in the solemn world of the dead.

(p. 75)

Although now passionately directed towards John, and incapable of feeling even a spasm of affection for or interest in a man, she is quite aware of her own attractions, and it is noticeable that the poet, W. B. Yeats, himself deeply involved with spiritism at this stage in his life, and even Sir Oliver Lodge cannot resist attempting to get her alone. John was quite obviously the intellectual force in these experiments, but it is hard to keep one's eye off a pretty woman, and Una with her charming ways drew men's attention even when the business was solemn.

(p. 76)

. . .John was drawn on by qualities in her own nature. She was a woman of exceptional intelligence. She was also a sexual invert, and under the strain of repression this factor can lead to exhibitionism.*

*Sir Comyn Berkeley, Ten Teachers. In the chapter on 'Neurasthenia in Females' (p. 481) he writes: 'Cases in which the symptoms are mainly due to sexual neurosis dependant on repression factors. . . subconscious projection. . .may be reinforced by an element of exhibitionism.'

(p. 82)

12. Una's divorce:

The Admiral was almost certainly justified in saying, or at least thinking, that Radclyffe Hall's influence on his wife was a baneful one. Not only had she abandoned him, but she had taken to wearing a tortoiseshell monocle, had adopted a long cigarette-holder, and wore breeches at a dog-show, all of which could be regarded as improper in 1918. He could see the change in her appearance. She was still a beautiful young woman of only 32, but he could see in her face the evidence of the hectic life she was leading. Troubridge was an extremely handsome man, and it must have shocked him that Una should prefer to live with this travesty of a woman than with him. He exuded male vitality, and he could not understand how these two women detested that essence. Nor could he possibly have imagined how deep their love for each other had become. It was not a case of sexual love only; it was an absolute awareness of each for the other that made the senses, the very thoughts and anxieties of one as real to the other as though they had occurred to her. Una notes in her diary examples of the constant telepathy between them. When one of them is coming home by train from London unannounced, the other starts out to walk to the station to meet her. When one is ill the other becomes ill; when one is happy, the spirits of the other lift with her. It was an intertwining of soul and body each with the other, and against this the appeal of male vitality had no chance whatsoever.

(pp. 89-90)

13. Fox-Pitt Slander Case:

Fox-Pitt was a man of extreme learning whose contribution to the practical uses of electricity had been of great importance. The loss of the millions he might have derived from his patents for incandescent lights, which might have soured the average man, had left Fox-Pitt seemingly unperturbed, for in addition to being very clever he was devoted to the moral uplift of mankind and thought of money as the root of all evil. Besides being absorbed in the work of the Society for Psychical Research, he was Vice-President and Treasurer of the Moral Education League. Egotism of any sort he detested, as much as he did immorality. He viewed the craving for personal survival after death, that is the persona in its earthly form instead of the discarnate spirit, as supremely egoistic and an offense against reason. That a paper like Radclyffe Hall's should be given by a person of Radclyffe Hall's immoral character under the aegis of the Society for Psychical Research was more than he could stomach. To understand his behaviour in

the trial we must think of him not as a scientific crackpot upset by the meddling of amateurs, but as a man of high ethical views defending these against the profanity of the godless.

(pp. 91-2)

II. Quotations from Cheney's Millay in Greenwich Village:

1. Even more dramatic than her change in religious attitudes was Millay's sexual metamorphosis. While at Vassar, she found more meaning in friendships with women than with men, and her play The Lamp and the Bell and her poem 'Memorial to D. C.' celebrate the power of lesbian love. Again, she needed her 'teachers,' Floyd Dell and other lovers, to initiate her into heterosexual love, which she so deftly expressed in sonnets such as 'What lips my lips have kissed,' 'Into the golden vessel of great song,' and 'Love is not all.'

. . .Here [in Greenwich Village] Millay was exposed to the most avant-garde ideas of the day, developed a broader concept of religion, and shifted from lesbian to heterosexual love. . .they were free of the repressions and limitations of the Silent Majority. [My italics.]

2. On Millay's love for other wimmin:

Finally, Millay perhaps learned from Sappho the concept of agape, particularly as it pertains to deep friendships between women. (Agape is a totally selfless, deeply spiritual love. A higher form of more physical love, or philos, agape is other-directed, almost divine love). Lesbian agape is the controlling theme of both The Lamp and the Bell and "Memorial to D. C."

Just as Sappho surrounded herself with young girls, at Vassar (1913-17) Millay gathered about her a circle of close friends--Charlotte (Charlie) Babcock, Anne Gardner, Frances Stout, Isobel Simpson, and Dorothy Coleman. Millay held Charlie, a pretty, plump, blue-eyed young woman, dearest of her Vassar group, as she revealed by her reaction to her "dear sister's" impending marriage to Mac Sills after graduating from Vassar in 1917. Characteristically, Millay treated the marriage in an outwardly lighthearted fashion, but in several unpublished letters she could not mask her profound sense of loss: "Charlie, I love you very dearly. Don't forget me entirely, just on account of that Mac Sills,--will you?" Three months later, Millay wrote Charlie, "Yes, dear, I will come and visit you if Mac goes away, and if you still want me." At Vassar, Millay dreaded the transient nature of love between women even more than she regretted passing loves with men.

(p. 15)

3. On The Lamp and the Bell:

Even though Millay wrote The Lamp and the Bell in Paris in 1921, the spirit of the play clearly comes from her days at Vassar. At the core of the play is the unselfish love between the more masculine, intelligent princess, Beatrice, and the more feminine, fragile daughter of Queen Octavia, Bianca. With the exception of Beatrice and Bianca, most of the characters in The Lamp and the Bell are stereotypes. Octavia, King Lorenzo's second wife, is the mildly wicked queen, perhaps a fastidious dean of women. The practical, humorous, a compassionate Lorenzo, who adores his daughter, is highly reminiscent of MacCracken.

Lorenzo is the most believable male character. Fidelio, the jester, is likeable and wise, but somewhat effeminate. (He resembles a Shakespearian wise fool.)

(p. 19)

4. Chenev's view of the Second Wave of Feminism: (incorrectly dated)

In Exiles Return, Malcolm Cowley commented that the Villagers' rejection of conventional standards led to a "private war between Greenwich Village and the Saturday Evening Post. . ." Finding bourgeois morality and values irrelevant, the Villagers formulated their own codes of sexual and social standards. Some of their concepts of women relate to the Women's Liberation Movement of the 1970's: married women should have independent interests and be self-supporting; husbands should share in household tasks; children are not necessary to a successful marriage; divorce should be easier to obtain; and, unmarried couples should be allowed to live together. The Villagers also foreshadowed the New Morality of our era: they did not expect either a man or woman to enter marriage as a virgin: some repudiated family relationships altogether.

(p. 36)

5. Millay as the "first" American feminist:

In many ways, Millay was the first American feminist.

(p. 45)

6. Millay becomes a heterosexual:

As Dell came to know Millay more intimately, he became alarmed at her preoccupation with lesbianism:

> With some of her poems she was...to give dignity and sweetness to those passionate friendships between girls in adolescence...

Dell felt that Millay was trapped in "the enchanted garden of childhood," which excluded males. At twenty-five, Millay was "terrified at the bogeys which haunt the realm of grown up man-and-woman love..." Dell urged her to seek psychological therapy to overcome her lesbiaism, but she refused, being

"hostile to Freudian ideas" as "a Teutonic attempt to lock women up in the home and restrict them to cooking and baby-tending."

As Millay's first male lover, Floyd Dell played an important role in shaping Millay's attitude toward the relationship of sex to love, an important concept in her love poetry. Millay seemed to prefer sexual experiences with men to those with women after her first encounter with Dell, but she nevertheless resented his intrusion into her innermost thoughts and being. But without Dell's intrustion, Millay might never have understood the necessity of physical love for a deep spiritual union. Some of the men she was later involved with remained purely physical objects to her. In "I being born a woman and distressed," she says of a past lover: "I find this frenzy insufficient reason / For conversation when we meet again." Yet with the men most important to her--Dell, Wilson, Ficke, and Boissevain--she was increasingly able to fuse sexual love with spiritual love.

(pp. 64-5)

7. Heterosexuality and Art:

Her feelings of pain and resentment toward Dell are understandable; most major changes in behavior involve considerable emotional and intellectual expense. Dell delved too deeply into Millay's psyche, so she rejected him. But he significantly shaped the future of both Millay the woman and Millay the artist--by affording her a glimpse of heterosexual love, he freed her to write some of the most beautiful love sonnets in the English language.

"Child of the lightning," Dell's sonnet written to Millay, reveals that his love for her was much more serious than hers for him. . .

(p. 68)

III. Quotations from Carr's biography of Carson McCullers:

1. In spite of Reeves's pride over his wife's accomplishments, it was recognition such as this that contributed to their tenuous marital relationship. To be the husband of Carson McCullers was sometimes devastating to his sense of manhood, . . .Reeves, the writer, was dead--and had been--once he consented to move into the shadow of his wife's genius. . .The tragedy of Reeves's life, and the pity of it, was what he had feared in the spring of 1945 upon his remarriage to Carson, in a sense, his capitulation, and then his compulsory disability discharge from the United States Army--that he could not always be a leader of men, a professional soldier, the head of a household, a man's man.

Therein lay another problem, too. Not strongly identified in his own sexuality--. . .having sexual problems himself which he could not resolve, Reeves was incapable of coping with his wife's sexual inclinations or of helping her to become more heterosexually oriented. Carson was completely open to her friends about her tremendous enjoyment in being physically close to attractive women. She was as frank and as open about this aspect of her nature as a child would be in choosing which toy he [sic!] most wanted to play with. She was always more physically attracted to women than to men. [My italics.]

(p. 295)

2. Carson's relationship with another women described as "childish":

The two women eventually became good friends, chatting almost as children together--or housewives--talking about food, recipes, small-town stories, people in the theatre, and other celebrities whom Miss Williams had met or heard of. They shared, also, an empathy for wounded and fragile things, for birds, for certain animals, for delicate flowers. Frequently, when they were both well enough, Rose Williams spent weekends with Carson in Nyack.

(p. 308)

IV. Quotations from Lessing's Memoirs of a Survivor:

1. I offered the big sofa in the living-room to June, but she preferred a mattress on Emily's floor, and even, I think, slept on it, though of course I wondered. Too often had I experienced a sharp shocked reaction to questions asked innocently. I really did not know if Emily and June would consider lesbianism as the most normal thing in the world, or as improper. Styles and morals had changed so sharply and so often in my lifetime, . . ., that I had learned long ago to accept whatever was the norm for that particular time and place. I rather believe that the two girls slept in each other's arms for comfort. [My italics.]

(p. 154)

2. There was also a woman, who led a small band of girls. They were self-consciously and loudly critical of male authority, male organisation, as if they had set themselves a duty always to be there commenting on everything the men did. They were a chorus of condemnation. Yet the leader seemed to find it necessary to spend a great deal of energy preventing individuals of her flock from straying off and attaching themselves to the men. [My italics.]

(p. 160)

3. Love, devotion, effort could only pour into her, a jug without a bottom, and then pour out, leaving no trace. She deserved nothing, was owed nothing, could not really be loved, and therefore could not be missed. So she had gone. Probably one of the women had been kind to her, and to this little glow of affection June had responded, as she had to Emily's. . .At last we agreed that the energetic and virile woman who led that band had captured the listless June with her energy, at a time when Emily did not have enough to go around.

(p. 167)

V. Quotation from Kellen's The Coming Age of Woman Power:

If lesbians are proud of their habit, it connotes to them the ultimate independence from that dreadful creature, man, whom they dislike intensely (and, in our day, often for good reason). But some of the lesbians interviewed are not totally convincing, because their lesbianism seems partly ideological rather than 'straight' and therefore presumably is less durable. If in the coming decade society becomes more feminized, more sensitive, more gentle in the way that seems possible; if it becomes thereby more truly civilized, more responsive to people's true condition and needs, homosexuality is likely to decline drastically. In one way that would be ironic: the gays of both sexes, having finally attained a liberation and social recognition of sorts after centuries of oppression and persecution and contempt, would then more or less vanish from the scene just when they have managed to make that scene. Yet everything suggests that homosexuality is likely to be less widespread in the 1980s, among men and women, than it ever has been, mainly because the liberated female will be a better mother to her growing children, but also for social reasons.

(pp. 128-9)

VI. Quotation from Ehrenreich's "Toward a Socialist Feminism":

At some level, perhaps not too well articulated, socialist feminism has been around for a long time. You are a woman in a capitalist society. You get pissed off: about the job, about the bills, about your husband (or ex), about the kids' school, the housework, being pretty, not being pretty, being looked at, not being looked at. . ., etc. If you think about all these things and how they fit together and what has to be changed, and then you look around for some words to hold all these thoughts together in abbreviated form, you'd almost have to come up with something like 'socialist feminism.'

(Heresies I, p. 4)